UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCI United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/087,672	02/27/2002	Jered Donald Aasheim	183343.01	6395	
	7590 10/23/2007 CORPORATION		EXAMINER		
ONE MICROSOFT WAY REDMOND, WA 98052-6399			PATEL, HETUL B		
KEDMOND, W	A 98032-0399		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
			2186		
			·		
		,	NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		,	10/23/2007	ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com ntovar@microsoft.com a-rydore@microsoft.com

Ø	V

Application No.	Applicant(s)	Applicant(s)	
10/087,672	AASHEIM ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Hetul Patel	2186		

Interview Summary	10/087,672	AASHEIMELAL	•	
" Interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Hetul Patel	2186		
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):			
(1) <u>Hetul Patel</u> .	(3) <u>Mark Niemann</u> .			
(2) William Breen (Reg. No.: 45,313).	(4)			
Date of Interview: 09 October 2007.				
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant 2	2) applicant's representative		_	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) No.			
Claim(s) discussed: 1.	•			
Identification of prior art discussed: Ban (USPN: 5,799,168) and Blumenau (USPN: 5,875,478).				
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g	ı)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	I/A.		
Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		if an agreement	was	
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no callowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.	opy of the amendments that w			
THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE A INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INT FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTE requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	last Office action has already OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM,	been filed, APPI DAYS FROM T WHICHEVER IS	LICANT IS HIS LATER, TO	
•				
			·	
•				
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an	H.B.	atel		

Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant's representative alleged that the combination of Ban and Blumenau would defeat the very purpose of Ban. Ban teaches a standarized flash driver installed on the CPU and sends the standarized commands that are then interpreted by "controllers" that are installed on the flash chip. Thus Ban places burden on the controller installed on the flash chip. On the other hand, the flash drivers resides as a component within an OS of the computer.

Examiner first pointed out that according to Fig. 3, the flash driver 306 is NOT within the OS 309 as claimed. Second, the controller is interpreted as a software entitiy in the Ban prior art and calling the combination of CPU and controllers a CPU as taught by Blumenau reference. This combination id not defeating the very purpose of the Ban because the functionality of the Ban and combination is unchanged and furthermore, the standarized CPU still will be used in the above combination.

Examiner suggested Applicant's representative to amend the claim(s) appropritely so it is supported by the original specification/figure(s) and present the response/arguments in the next official response to PTO.